DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 031 793 EA 002 434

By-Campbell, Roald F., Ed.; And Others

Educational Problems in the Urban Setting.

Pub Date 69

Note-19p.; Chapter 1 in EDUCATION AND URBAN RENAISSANCE. Book based on papers presented at Natl. Conf. on Educ Dimension of Model Cities Prog. (Univ. of Chicago Ctr. for Continuing Educ.).

Available from-John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 605 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10016 ($5.95).

EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$1.05

Descriptors-Boards of Education, *City Demography, *City Problems, Educationally Disadvantaged, *Educational Problems, Ghettos, Racial Discrimination, School Community Relationship, School Demography, School Planning, Tax Support, Teacher Shortage, *Urban Environment, *Urban Schools

In spite of the trend toward suburbanization, the cities continue to be the hub of institutional America. The assimilation of growing numbers of uneducated, unskilled, and minority group immigrants in the face of declining physical, fiscal, and leadership resources is the basic problem confronting cities. The ghetto is populated by individuals possessing insufficient educational and occupational tools to manage in an urban setting. Although the schools are increasingly called upon to solve this problem, planning for building and staffing schools is frustrated by burgeoning and shifting enrollments. The difficulties of getting competent teachers into the ghetto aggravate the crucial problem of the concentration of large numbers of students with serious educational deficiencies. Today we have reason to question the old assumptions that school systems should remain isolated from surrounding institutions and that lay boards of education insure reflection of the public will in school policies. (DE)

ED031793

EDUCATION AND URBAN RENAISSANCE

This book is based on papers presented at the
National Conference on the Educational Dimension of the Model Cities Program held at
The University of Chicago
Center for Continuing Education

EA002934

Edited by
ROALD F. CAMPBELL
LUCY ANN MARX
RAPHAEL O. NYSTRAND

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

JOHN WILEY & SONS, INC.
New York London Sydney Toronto

$5.95

1/11/68 ✓
✓

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY J. S. Barnes, Jr.

TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER."

Copyright © 1969 by John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced by any means, nor transmitted, nor translated into a machine language without the written permission of the publisher.

Library of Congress Catalog Card Number: 68-56160
SBN 471 13250 0
Printed in the United States of America

CONTRIBUTING AUTHORS

STEPHEN K. BAILEY

DONALD BOURGEOIS

PAUL W. BRIGGS

WILLARD J. CONGREVE

LUVERN L. CUNNINGHAM

JOHN H. FISCHER

MORRIS JANOWITZ

DAVID LEWIS

HYLAN LEWIS

JOSEPH J. SCHWAB

H. RALPH TAYLOR

FOREWORD

During the past decade many individuals and institutions have become increasingly concerned with the magnitude of urban educational problems. Located in the midst of an urban renewal area, The University of Chicago has been one of these institutions. Recently, a university planning committee decided to provide a national forum for considering these problems. The central question to be discussed by this forum was: *What are the characteristics of an ideal urban school?*

While the planning committee was in its early stages of deliberation, Congress passed the *Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966* (Public Law 89-754), commonly referred to as the Model Cities legislation. It occurred to the planning committee that in calling for educational components in Model City areas, this legislation was encouraging the establishment of ideal urban schools. Sensing some unity of purpose with this legislation and believing that it provides a unique opportunity to affect the course of urban education, the committee decided to hold a conference that would direct attention to "Educational Dimensions of the Model Cities Program." Participants at this conference included school and local government officials from major cities, representatives of community organizations and agencies, and university scholars.* The conference was supported, in part, by Science Research Associates, The Sears Foundation, and The Wieboldt Foundation.

Title I of Public Law 89-754 encourages the establishment of Model Cities (or, in more recent terminology, "model neighborhoods") by offering financial and technical assistance to cities:

> . . . to plan, develop, and carry out locally prepared and scheduled comprehensive city demonstration programs containing new and imaginative proposals to rebuilt or revitalize large slum and blighted areas; to expand housing, job, and income opportunities; to reduce dependence on welfare payments; *to improve educational facilities and programs,* [emphases added]; to combat disease and ill health; to reduce the incidence of crime and to establish better access between home and jobs; and generally to improve living conditions for the people who live in such areas, and to accomplish these objectives through the most effective and economical concentration and coordination of Federal, State, and local public and private efforts to improve the quality of urban life.

*Appendix A contains a list of conference participants.

Title II of the law also has importance for educators:

> It is the purpose of this title to provide, through greater coordination of Federal programs and through supplementary grants for certain federally assisted development projects, additional encouragement and assistance to States and localities for making comprehensive metropolitan planning and programming effective.

Thus the act offers incentives to educators and other local officials who wish to establish "ideal" urban schools and / or who are willing to consider urban educational problems on a metropolitan basis.

Our committee was impressed by the comprehensive approach called for in this legislation, for many previous efforts to treat urban educational problems have been characterized by a fragmented and incremental approach. At the federal level, for example, the Office of Education, the Office of Economic Opportunity, and the Department of Labor have developed independent job training programs. Few attempts have been made to develop a coordinated approach to the totality of educational problems that confront a particular city. Perhaps more important, previous efforts have been essentially attempts to add this or that to existing programs. Potential reformers have been forced to work within the strictures imposed by existing social contexts and the traditional operating patterns of established institutions. One could reasonably ask whether the history of efforts to improve urban education might reflect more success if the disadvantages of fragmented and incremental approaches could have been avoided.

It would appear that, as conceived by Congress, Public Law 89-754 offers cities the opportunity to overcome these disadvantages in planning educational components for Model City demonstration projects. The act provides a mandate to create new urban environments and, as an essential part thereof, to develop coordinated educational programs within new contexts. It marks the first time that legislation concerned with urban development makes specific reference to schools, boards of education, and their need to relate to mutually reinforcing institutional sectors of society. For the first time, there is opportunity for a community to design and perfect totally new institutions and institutional arrangements to satisfy societal needs.

Acknowledging the opportunities present in the Model Cities legislation, there is still room for apprehension about the way in which it will be implemented. There is the possibility, for example, that certain portions of the law or the program guidelines relating to it may be inappropriate in some respect. There is the further possibility that, in developing Model City plans, opportunities to improve educational programs will not be recognized as clearly or treated as seriously by city officials as will simultaneous opportunities to improve housing

and other physical characteristics of the community. Moreover, there is danger that, in planning educational components, those responsible will not think "big" enough, thereby replicating the incremental errors of the planners who preceded them.

We held our conference at a time too early to assess the impact of the Model Cities legislation or even to evaluate the efforts of those cities that submitted proposals for a Model City demonstration to the Department of Housing and Urban Development. We hope that we held the conference early enough to call attention to the educational possibilities inherent in the act, to identify potential weaknesses in the legislation, and to give some assistance to individuals charged with developing city programs. We further hope that, whatever the ultimate outcome of the Model Cities Program, the ideas presented at this conference will be useful to persons interested in the question, "What are the characteristics of an ideal urban school?" We would emphasize that the significance of this question transcends the fate of any particular piece of legislation. With or without the Model Cities legislations the problems dealt with here must be faced by the cities and the nation.

The first chapter describes educational problems in the urban setting. Chapters 2 through 12 contain the papers presented by conference participants. In some cases, these papers were followed by questions and answers from the floor. An example of these exchanges is included in Chapter 2, to which it pertains. Considerable time at the conference was devoted to small group discussions. Chapter 13 summarizes the themes that emerged from those sessions and blends them with our perspectives in a concluding statement and a set of recommendations regarding urban schools of the future.

Chicago, Illinois
Columbus, Ohio
September 1968

Roald F. Campbell
Lucy Ann Marx
Raphael O. Nystrand

CONTENTS

	1	Educational Problems in the Urban Setting EA002434	1
Part I		**The Model Cities Program: An Approach to the Problems of Urban Education**	**13**
	2	Educational Dimensions of the Model Cities Program *H. Ralph Taylor*	15
	3	Educational Problems and the Model Cities Program *Paul W. Briggs*	29
Part II		**Serving Urban Clients**	**35**
	4	Integration and Disintegration of Education *Joseph J. Schwab*	37
	5	Who Shall Be Served? *Hylan Lewis*	45
	6	Humanizing Teaching *Willard J. Congreve*	53

1

EDUCATIONAL PROBLEMS IN THE URBAN SETTING

One city school superintendent recently reported:

> We have built schools behind barbed wire fences with armed guards watching the buildings as they went up. We have used as many as 200 policemen to open a high school and keep it open. We have held school board meetings with armed guards in the audience. The superintendent has been escorted to meetings after the audience and the Board of Education is seated with one armed guard in front of him and one behind him. Last week, we had four schools bombed. Two weeks ago, we had two schools bombed. Three weeks ago, we put 1,000 children on the street while an arsonist burned a school to the ground. This week, a bomb was thrown into a school during the school day and landed in a classroom. It exploded in front of a group of children. We have gone through pickets. We have had pray-ins. We have had our share of boycotts, riots, violence, sanctions, and strikes. And as superintendent of schools, I probably am the recipient of more advice than any other living American.

EA 002 434

Despite such problems, city schools are confronted with a revolution in rising expectations. Now when more city students are completing high school than in previous eras, society is simultaneously increasing its concern about the plight of dropouts. The man on the street as well as the academician wants schools to start educating children earlier, to keep them longer, and to teach them more than ever before. In one sense, this concern is economic, for the

value of education as a qualifier for job entry has been demonstrated. However, the recent demands upon schools also have social bases. The city school system, according to Street, is ". . . a strategic social agency in alleviating poverty, reducing delinquency, integrating a segregated community, and correcting other social ills."[1]

The escalation of public conflict surrounding school affairs has been a corollary to increasing social demands upon city schools. Matters that have their roots in social problems are among the most controversial current political issues. Because the public believes that schools have great power to affect the course of such matters, deliberations by school officials regarding the adoption of a particular book, the location of a particular school, or almost any other issue may be accompanied by public petitions, boycotts, or even violence. Nowhere is such action more apparent than in our major cities. City school officials rarely make a decision that does not embitter some segment of the public and frequently face the threat of reprisals from disenchanted groups. Matters once considered to be resolvable only through the application of professional expertise have become subjects of intense public controversies.

The capacity of city school systems to ameliorate social conditions is limited not only by conflict about what constitutes appropriate school actions, but by the nature of these conditions as well. For example, the presence of delinquents in inner-city schools constitutes a deterrent to the recruitment of teachers who could aid such students. Moreover, the concentrations of poverty-level families do not provide the tax base necessary to support expensive remedial programs. The inhibiting features of this environmental dependence are clearest when inner-city schools are juxtaposed with those of surrounding suburbs where poverty is not a fact of life and resources for improving educational programs are more readily appropriated. Most of the best schools in this country are in suburbs where educational problems are least severe. Moreover, this anomalous qualitative gap between central-city and suburban schools appears to be increasing. Reducing that gap by redressing the special problems of central-city schools is the top-priority challenge to contemporary American educators.

The Urban Setting

Urbanization has been a prominent theme in American development. At the time of the 1960 census, 70 per cent of the 180 million Americans were classified as urban residents. Projections indicate that by 1980 these figures

[1]David Street, "Public Education and Social Welfare in the Metropolis," in *Organizing for Community Welfare*, edited by Mayer N. Zald (Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1967), p. 67.

will increase to more than 80 per cent and 241 million.[2] The extent of population concentration in the nation is reflected by the fact that 63 per cent of the 1960 population resided in 212 Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas.[3] By 1965, the Bureau of the Census recognized 222 such areas in the United States and estimated their total popululation to be 126 million persons. Projections for 1980 suggest a metropolitan population of 170 million, a figure nearly equal to the total population of the nation in 1960.[4]

Most of the recent growth in metropolitan areas has been in suburbs rather than central cities. The trend toward suburbanization began in the 1920's as automobiles gained popular acceptance and has been encouraged by other transportation and communications developments. Between 1950 and 1960, suburban growth in metropolitan areas occurred at a rate of 48.5 per cent, while central-city populations grew at an average rate of only 10.8 per cent. As Hauser notes, even these figures underestimate the decline of central-city populations.[5] Most of the central-city population growth during the 1950's occurred in relatively small cities or in cities of the South and West where annexations accounted for much of it. Comparatively large and established cities suffered population declines; indeed, this was the case with eleven of the twelve largest cities in 1950.[6] Many people with the means to do so have exchanged living in the central city for a home in the surrounding suburbs. In some cases, commerce and industry is beginning to follow its executives and its clientele to the shopping plazas and industrial parks of the suburbs. Central cities are left with declining populations and a dearth of acknowledged leaders.

Cities, nevertheless, continue to be the hub of institutional America. They are, as Scott Greer has noted, "the point at which organizational roads cross . . . the key arena in which the organizational output of one organization becomes the input of another."[7] Five days a week suburban commuters swell city populations by as much as 50 per cent as they join residents of the city to operate lathes, elevators, or computers; sell stocks, shoes, or silverplate; repair teeth, boilers, or sidewalks; make cereal, tires, or automobiles; or per-

[2]Philip M. Hauser and Martin Taitel, "Population Trends—Prologue to Educational Programs," in *Designing Education for the Future*, Vol. 1, edited by Edgar L. Morphet and Charles O. Ryan (New York: Citation Press, 1967), p. 25.

[3]The U.S. Bureau of the Census defines a Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area as a county containing at least one central city of at least 50,000 persons and contiguous counties that are socially and economically integrated with the central city.

[4]Hauser and Taitel, *op. cit.*, p. 30.

[5]*Ibid.*, p. 34.

[6]*Ibid.*, p. 34.

[7]Scott Greer, *The Emerging City* (New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1962), p. 64.

form some other specialized function that benefits unknown clients. Cities also are the primary centers for culture and recreation. Many of the same people who come to work in the city remain for an evening or return on the weekend to enjoy its library, opera, theater, symphony, zoo, baseball team, or other entertainment resources. The city as a workplace and a cultural and recreational center offers an incredible range of personal opportunities and brings the diverse interests of vast numbers of people into mutual contact.

The aggregation of so many people on a common site introduces the need to maintain order among them. Much of this is provided by the bureaucratic rules of institutions to whom employees in the city owe allegiance and by the dynamics of the market.[8] These mechanisms, however, are not sufficiently potent to insure the presence of necessary services and to minimize the possibilities of conflict in our cities. Municipal governments attempt to meet these needs by providing, for residents and commuters alike, police protection, fire protection, transportation facilities, and other services essential to the public welfare. But today the problems associated with industrialization and urbanization exceed the capacity or inclination of city officials to combat them. Thus while commuters can retire to relative security and spaciousness, city dwellers are left every evening to cope with the soot, the smoke, and the smell that are the residue of the working day, to tolerate the lack of play space for their children, and to speak above the noise made by traffic, commuter trains, and late factory shifts.

There is a traditional view which holds that cities are "human melting pots" where individuals of diverse ethnicity and experiences continually interact and become assimilated to the American way of life. This metaphor is more appropriate when we regard the city as a marketplace or worksite than when we consider it as a residential location. Although many Irishmen, Italians, and descendants of emigrants from Central and Eastern Europe have moved from ethnic neighborhoods to a broader residential society, most cities continue to be a patchwork of enclaves differentiated by socioeconomic status and ethnicity. In the case of at least one group, Blacks, residential segregation in American cities is apparently increasing. Norton Long has posited that two conflicting norms, "that of equality among citizens and that of differential regard for achievement," have attained stature in metropolitan areas.[9] It is primarily through the segregation of housing opportunities that the former norm is most often violated and the latter receives public expression. As Long puts it, "The suburb is the Northern way to insure separate and unequal."[10] Neighborhood insularity is protected by (1) the relatively high cost

[8] *Ibid.*, pp. 64–65.

[9] Norton E. Long, "Political Science and the City," in *Urban Research and Policy Planning*, edited by Leo F. Schnore and Henry Fagin (Beverly Hills, Calif.: Page Publications, 1967), p. 254.

[10] *Ibid.*, p. 254.

of obtaining housing and maintaining the neighborhood life style in some areas, (2) illegal but effective real estate covenants and restrictions, and (3) very strong and visible informal sanctions.

Realizing that not everyone in the suburbs is wealthy and that not everyone in the central city is poor, we may distinguish in general terms among three metropolitan neighborhood types. The first is the middle- and upper-class suburb and city enclave which contain most of the better housing in the metropolitan area and in which living expenses are sufficiently high so that most city residents cannot afford to live there. The second type contains the largest part of the metropolitan population and is comprised of working-class suburbs and fringe areas of the city. Here, both the housing and the people tend to be older than in other suburbs. Many of the residents are refugees from the central city who moved to the fringe when it was a status area, who have matured with the neighborhood, and who are hesitant to move again. Other residents in these areas are younger refugees from the central city or newcomers to the metropolitan area. In many cases these people would prefer to live in a middle-class suburb but cannot afford to do so. Residents in the fringe areas are most fearful of "invasion" from the central-city areas and are most likely to utilize real estate restrictions and informal sanctions (e.g., the periodic anti-Black violence in Cicero, Illinois) to discourage such population shifts.

The third metropolitan neighborhood type is the core or inner-city area, which contains the oldest, least desirable housing in the city or relatively new, but often crowded, public housing units and which offers "housing of the last resort" to the aged, the poor, and, most recently, the Blacks. The immigration of Blacks into central cities has been recent but steady. By 1960, 58 per cent of Southern Blacks and 95 per cent of Northern and Western Blacks lived in urban places. Moreover, almost 38 per cent of the American Black population resided in our 24 largest metropolitan areas, and 83 per cent of them lived in cities rather than suburbs.[11] By moving to the central city, the Southern Black follows the traditional path of urban immigrants. However, the reluctance of fringe-area residents to assimilate him has (1) forced the Black to live under conditions that are crowded as well as otherwise inferior and (2) spurred greater movement to the suburbs and outlying areas by whites who live on the perimeter of Black ghettos and believe that their expansion is imminent. The flight of the white threatens to transform cities that once were melting pots into segregated societies.

The political boundaries that divide cities and their suburbs and the social boundaries that define various neighborhoods have psychological implications that bear upon the future of cities. In the first place, they encourage what

[11]Hauser and Tatiel, *op. cit.*, pp. 44–45.

might be termed politics of limited involvement. Given the homogeneity of suburbs and city neighborhoods as well as the limited scope of decisions that can be made at that level, neighborhood politics often tend to be issueless if not trivial. On the other hand, city government tends to be highly professionalized and difficult for individual citizens to affect. The typical citizen response is to remain uninvolved at the city-wide level and to seek a neighborhood in which "things run as they should" without requiring personal participation.

We would suggest that urban political and social barriers also contribute to bases for urban conflict. This conflict may erupt between central-city and suburban residents as in cases of inner-city rent strikes directed at absentee landlords or in disputes over city occupational taxes designed to force suburban commuters to share the cost of city services. However, it may be that these barriers also help set the stage for conflict among residents of inner-city areas. There is some evidence that suppression of conflict in a given community depends on the residence therein of persons who possess skills in conflict management, skills that correlate with education and occupational status.[12] The lack of such persons in the ghetto and the high-density conditions under which ghetto residents are forced to live create potentially incendiary situations. In personal terms, this means that barroom brawls, street fights, muggings, and robberies are more likely in areas where anticonflict norms are not supported by strong neighborhood sanctions. The disastrous riots that developed from minor ghetto incidents in Rochester, Cincinnati, Newark, Detroit, and other cities during the summer of 1967 were poignant testimony to the capacity of the ghetto to generate conflict.

We do well to remember that urbanization is more than a clustering of people and institutions. It is also a way of life that demands personal interdependence and adherence to impersonal rules and procedures. The immigrant who comes to the city may be unfamiliar with traffic lights, expressways, charge accounts, and employment agencies. If he does not know how to read or write, his chances of understanding and utilizing these urban commonplaces are slight and his chances of obtaining a desirable job are very limited.

Cities have long faced the problem of teaching urban newcomers how to get along in the metropolis. Today this is more difficult than before, for most immigrants are Blacks, who, because of their visibility and because of long-standing prejudices on the part of established urban residents, are often less than welcome. The untutored immigrant also is faced with finding a job in a labor market which, unlike that of years ago, has relatively few openings for

[12]For a discussion of this notion as it applies in suburban school settings, see David W. Minar, "The Community Basis of Conflict in School System Politics," *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 31 (December, 1966), pp. 823–835.

unskilled workers. The assimilation of growing numbers of such immigrants in the face of declining physical, fiscal, and leadership resources is the basic problem confronting modern cities.

The task of ameliorating this problem has been thrust increasingly upon urban schools. This has come about partly because the visibility of the issue and the rhetoric of equal opportunity have become so prominent that society must assign this responsibility to some public agency if only to salve its conscience. More importantly, this obligation has fallen upon the schools because the crux of the required solution is educative in nature. People who are unprepared to live in an urban setting must be taught the norms and conventions that are basic to public health and safety and must be prepared to assume a place in the urban work force. Given the present rate of immigration to cities, the alternatives to providing such educational programs are tolerance of larger public relief roles and continued rebellion against the "established" society.

To be sure, the retention of whatever economic and social stability now exists in our cities requires that city schools do a better job with the members of underprivileged minority groups who constitute an ever-increasing percentage of their enrollment. But the task of the school is broader than this. Assimilation requires receptivity by an existing group as well as entry by a new one. The urban middle class must be encouraged to remain in and, in some cases, to return to the central city. If the tide of white migration to the suburbs is to be stemmed, city schools must work to make cities better places for all people to live. Havighurst has elaborated this challenge and the consequences of not meeting it:

> The city will only be a desirable place to live if the schools can satisfy the educational requirements of all levels and groups—the prosperous and the socially disadvantaged, the gifted and the slow, the able and the handicapped, the child, the adolescent, and the adult. But if the city ceases to be a desirable place to live for all kinds of people, the educational problems will also become far greater as the pace of economic and racial stratification is intensified.[13]

Problems Confronting Urban Schools

Thus we see that population shifts have contributed to the seriousness of urban school problems. Despite a decline in the total population of many cities since 1950, public school enrollments in these cities increased markedly during the same period. Of the twelve largest American cities in 1950, none experienced an enrollment increase of less than 20 per cent, and five in-

[13]Robert J. Havighurst, *Statement to the Board of Education on the Survey of the Chicago Public Schools*, November 12, 1964, p. 3. (mimeographed).

creased their enrollments by more than 50 per cent. The percentage gain in New York was only slightly more than 20 per cent, but the net increase of 183,155 pupils constituted an increment larger than the total enrollment of all but seven American school systems. City school systems have been forced to expand their programs at a rapid pace to respond to the demands created by immigrants of school age.

Most city immigrants can obtain housing only in the large, but already densely populated, ghetto areas. To build schools to serve the children in these neighborhoods is to build schools that will be segregated. Moreover, extensive population shifts within the city makes school site selection very difficult. Construction of public housing projects, razing of dwellings for public purposes, eviction, or the chance to improve one's life style slightly—these and other factors contribute to high rates of intracity mobility. Schools in which the enrollment turnover is more than 100 per cent from October to May are not uncommon.

Building and staffing schools to accommodate burgeoning and shifting enrollments is a frustrating matter for school officials. It is not unusual to open a new school and find that the number of children who present themselves is twice that for which it was intended. In the period from 1952 to 1963, Chicago erected 4,801 new classrooms in 236 new buildings or additions. Four miles of public housing on one street in Chicago requires a school in almost every other block. Yet these schools and those like them in other cities are still overcrowded and, in some cases, so old as to be virtually obsolete. Cities cannot afford to destroy and rebuild these schools so long as there are children in need of classrooms. The construction of new schools on new sites is discouraged by the costs of obtaining such sites. Calvin Gross has stated that when he was superintendent of schools in New York an elementary school site would often cost $1 million and require the displacement of 500 families.[14] As a result, new city schools are usually designed to house large enrollments, a fact that prompts questions about the impersonality of education in the ghetto.

Finding teachers to work in the central city has been difficult because of the general shortage of teachers, the unsavory public image of the ghetto, the difficult conditions under which inner-city teaching must sometimes take place, and the difficulties some cities have in offering salaries that are competitive with those in surrounding districts. Moreover, many cities compound the problem by establishing examination and certification procedures that discourage many highly qualified candidates from applying for city positions

[14]Calvin E. Gross, "Urgent Issues in the Big Cities: Implications for Administrators," in *Research Seminar on Racial and Other Issues Affecting School Administration in the Great Cities of America*, edited by Michael D. Usdan, Cooperative Research Project No. G-028 (Evanston, Ill.: Northwestern University, 1966), p. 10.

while allowing marginal applicants to teach full-time with "temporary" certification. In Chicago, for example, it is estimated that 25 per cent of all public school teaching positions are held by full-time teachers with temporary certificates.[15]

Gross recalls that New York City used to begin school in the fall without teachers for 200 classrooms and that during his first year on the job a teacher was not assigned to every classroom until February.[16] Moveover, merely the placing of teachers in ghetto classrooms begs the very serious question of preparing to work effectively in this context and also ignores the intracity mobility of teachers. Inner-city assignments have typically been stopping-off places for teachers who are new to the system, uncertificated (the majority of teachers with temporary certificates teach in inner-city schools and may constitute as much as 70 per cent of the faculty in a given school), and inexperienced. Their seniority increases along with their competence. Hence they often accept opportunities to transfer to city-fringe areas, leaving their ghetto assignments once again to neophytes.

The shortage of competent teachers in the ghetto aggravates the most crucial problem of the urban schools—the concentration of large numbers of students with serious educational deficiencies. It is no secret that a major proportion of students who account for the lower range of scores on national intelligence and achievement tests are inner-city residents. We know too that because of lack of early educative experiences in the home, inner-city children begin school at a disadvantage[17]—in ability, interest, and motivation. Some may attend as many as twelve or fifteen different schools, remaining in any one scarcely long enough for the teacher to learn their names. Many come from homes where conditions are unhealthy and not conducive to learning.

A factor contributing to student learning difficulties is the attitude of many teachers who, recognizing some characteristics in students' backgrounds, assume that these students cannot learn. Such teachers mistreat children under the guise of recognizing individual differences. Kenneth Clark has warned of the consequences of such miseducation:

> Once one organizes an educational system where children are placed in tracks or where certain judgments about their ability determine what is done for them or how much they are taught or not taught, the horror is that the results seem to justify the assumptions. . . . Children who are treated as if they are uneducable almost invariably become uneducable. . . . They have a sense of personal

[15] *Agreement between the Board of Education of the City of Chicago and the Chicago Teachers Union*, p. 3.

[16] Gross, *op. cit.*, p. 7.

[17] Benjamin S. Bloom, *Stability and Change in Human Characteristics*, (New York: Wiley, 1964). p. 10.

humiliation and unworthiness. They react negatively and hostilely and aggressively to the educational process. They hate teachers, they hate schools, they hate anything that seems to impose upon them this denigration, because they are not being respected as human beings, because they are sacrificed in a machinery of efficiency and expendability, because their dignity and potential as human beings are being obscured and ignored in terms of educationally irrelevant factors—their manners, their speech, their dress or their apparent disinterest.[18]

The monumental task of the school is to recognize the special needs of children on an individual basis and to maximize their educational opportunities. To accomplish this task, the urban school as a minimum should offer individualized instruction, small classes, the most up-to-date instructional materials, and auxiliary professional services. The development of such a program is difficult, and its cost is great.

Metropolitan population shifts also have placed urban school systems in a fiscal dilemma. On the one hand, these shifts have deposited the largest number of students with educational deficiencies for which the remedies are most expensive in the inner city. On the other hand, the same shifts have moved much of the taxable property that could pay for such educational programs from the central city to the suburbs. Public schools derive the bulk of their support from local property taxes, a condition that was more suitable to previous generations when local revenues claimed the major part of total tax dollars. Today state and federal sources claim an increasing share of tax revenues without restoring proportionate amounts to public school usages. Moreover, the per pupil tax valuation base has declined in most major cities in recent years. Thus there are fewer local dollars per pupil available for educational purposes than used to be the case. Compounding the situation further is the fact that other local government departments are making increasing claims upon city revenues. Cities, more than suburbs, are required to spend large amounts of local tax dollars for police and fire protection, parks and playgrounds, maintenance of streets and expressways, sanitation services, welfare services, and other public services and facilities.

This "municipal overburden" created by demands to support nonschool public services works to the disadvantage of urban school systems. A case in point is Pittsburgh where 61 cents of every property tax dollar go to nonschool government units. The average Pennsylvania community requires only 22 cents of each property tax dollar for nonschool services.[19] Suburban residents profit not only in having additional funds available to support schools, but also by sharing the police protection, parks, public transportation, and

[18]Kenneth B. Clark, *Dark Ghetto* (New York: Harper and Row, 1965), p. 128.

[19]Research Council of the Great Cities Program for School Management, *The Challenge of Financing Schools in Great Cities* (Chicago: The Research Council, 1964).

other services paid for by Pittsburgh. City residents, on the other hand, are faced with the need to spend more for public education, in the face of tax rates that already are relatively high.

A final cluster of problems associated with urban schools relates to their organization and management. The prevailing pattern of public school organization in most cities has its roots in nineteenth-century assumptions that the school must be independent of surrounding institutions, that suitable education will take place when students are divided equally among available teachers, and that a lay board can direct school operations in accord with the public will. Today we have reason to question these assumptions.

Education now is a concern of many institutions other than schools. Women's groups sponsor Headstart programs, defense contractors administer Job Corps centers, and community organizations run adult education programs. The educational needs of American business and industry are such that they spend vast sums of money to train personnel who have completed normal schooling. The development of educational materials and the provision of related services are the concerns of many new organizations, including regional educational laboratories, giant business combines such as General Learning Corporation, and other publishing, testing, research, and service-oriented firms. More established community agencies such as police, housing, health, and welfare groups are becoming increasingly interested in coordinating their activities with various school programs. The present relationship of schools to these institutions and agencies is unsatisfactory. Duplication of services, interorganizational jealousies, and lack of cooperation characterize the situation in many cities. The development of external relationships that will maximize the community educational benefits available to all local clients is a problem that schools must consider jointly with other relevant groups.

City school systems are among the largest bureaucratic organizations in the nation. Although the interactions between teacher and pupils in a given classroom are still paramount in teaching, the need for flexibility and adaptability in classroom arrangements and teaching procedures is increasingly apparent. Meanwhile, the management activities required to bring about appropriate teacher-pupil interactions are becoming more complex, with little evidence of concomitant gains in classroom flexibility and adaptability. Shortcomings of communication and coordination also suggest that the effectiveness of these procedures is in doubt. In many cities, the prevailing administrative practices impede the assignment of highly qualified teachers to inner-city schools, discourage desirable curriculum differences among various schools, make experimentation difficult, create barriers to relationships between the schools and community, and sustain an atmosphere of professional ambiguity in which it is virtually impossible to supervise and evaluate the performance of teachers and administrators.

Finally, it would appear that, in at least some cities, lay boards of education are no longer bodies that ensure that the public will is reflected in school policies. Both the representativeness and the policy-making capability of these boards have been questioned in recent years.[20] Contemporary school boards function within a realm of growing constraints imposed by their need to rely on administrative judgment, the increasing power of teachers, the pressures of school clients and various other groups, and the increasing impact of state and federal legislation and court interpretations. It is at the school board level that the great educational needs of our cities come face to face with the diversity of interests represented in the city. The most visible product of this confrontation is frequently conflict within the board and/or between the board and various segments of the community. In policy terms, the product is too often a painfully arrived-at compromise that satisfies no one, adheres closely to previous policies, and contains the spark that will provoke the next dispute. It could be that city boards of education as now constituted have lost their viability as governing structures in urban society and that major breakthroughs in urban educational policy-making must await the formation of new governing arrangements.

[20]For a series of papers analyzing contemporary American school boards, see the report of the Cubberley Conference, "School Boards in an Era of Conflict," in *The American School Board Journal.* Vol. 154, No. 3, March, 1967.